26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7		
8	LARRY BOWOTO, et al.,	No. C 99-02506 SI
9	Plaintiffs,	ORDER RE: ROBINSON UROUPA DEPOSITION
10	v.	DEPOSITION
11	CHEVRONTEXACO CORP., et al.,	
12	Defendants.	
13		
14	By letter briefs, the parties bring before the Court a discovery dispute regarding the upcoming	
15	deposition of Robinson Uroupa. At a November 9, 2005, case management conference, the Court ruled that	
16	defendants could question Uroupa for ten minutes regarding the forged verification of Obele Ignone. The	
17	parties now seek clarification of the scope of questioning that the Court contemplated in its ruling.	
18	To the extent there is a difference between the parties' positions, the Court agrees with plaintiffs.	
19	Defendants may question Uroupa about the statements John Ikenyan made in his interrogatory responses, but	
20	may not go beyond those statements to question Uroupa about other conversations he may have had with	
21	Ikenyan or Ignone.	
22	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
23	Dated: November 15, 2005	
24		
25		SUSAN ILLSTON

SUSAN ILLSTON

United States District Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>There may not be. Defendant's own description of what they seek is "to examine Mr. Uroupa on this new statement by Mr. Ikenyan and determine whether it refreshes his recollection that he in fact committed, and admitted to, the forgery." Def. Br. at 1 (emphasis added).

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LARRY BOWOTO, et al.,

No. C 99-02506 SI

Plaintiffs,

ORDER RE: ROBINSON UROUPA DEPOSITION

v.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CHEVRONTEXACO CORP., et al.,

Defendants.

By letter briefs, the parties bring before the Court a discovery dispute regarding the upcoming deposition of Robinson Uroupa. At a November 9, 2005, case management conference, the Court ruled that defendants could question Uroupa for ten minutes regarding the forged verification of Obele Ignone. The parties now seek clarification of the scope of questioning that the Court contemplated in its ruling.

To the extent there is a difference between the parties' positions, the Court agrees with plaintiffs. Defendants may question Uroupa about the statements John Ikenyan made in his interrogatory responses, but may not go beyond those statements to question Uroupa about other conversations he may have had with Ikenyan or Ignone.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 15, 2005

United States District Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>There may not be. Defendant's own description of what they seek is "to examine Mr. Uroupa on this new statement by Mr. Ikenyan and determine whether it refreshes his recollection that he in fact committed, and admitted to, the forgery." Def. Br. at 1 (emphasis added).